DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 344 CS 502 203

AUTHOR Hellweg, Susan A.
TITLE Perceived Immediate Superior Credibility and Homophily as a Function of External Conflict within a Military Organization.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Portland, Oregon, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict; *Credibility; *Group Dynamics; Group Relations; *Military Personnel; *Problem Solving; Speech Communication; *Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS Communications Research

ABSTRACT

Twenty-five groups, each consisting of one superior and three subordinates, participated in a problem-solving exercise to test the hypotheses that subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior as more credible and more homophilous than those who are not exposed to external conflict. The groups were composed of military men who normally worked together in prescribed roles. Two thirds of the groups were exposed to the "external conflict" treatment while the remaining one third served as control groups and were exposed to the "no external conflict" treatment. A posttest measure for credibility and homophily was administered to the subordinates; no superiors completed the measure. Just prior to the administration of the posttest, a brief questionnaire was given to all subordinates to determine whether or not they perceived conflict while participating in the exercise. The results did not provide clear support for the hypotheses. No significant differences in the credibility and homophily of superiors as perceived by subordinates were found between the experimental and the control groups. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED158344

PERCEIVED IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR CREDIBILITY AND HOMOPHILY AS A FUNCTION OF EXTERNAL CONFLICT WITHIN A MILITARY ORGANIZATION

Susan A. Hellweg
Communication Research and Service
University of Southern California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan A. Hellweg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention
Organizational Communication Division
Top Three Program

April 1976
Portland, Oregon

The author is currently a doctoral student in Speech Communication at the University of Southern California and is the Administrative Assistant to the Dean of Academic Planning at California State College, Dominguez Hills.

CS500203

PRECEIVED IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR CREDIBILITY AND HOMOPHILY AS A FUNCTION OF EXTERNAL CONFLICT WITHIN A MILITARY ORGANIZATION

Context of the Problem

A formal organization, according to Schein (1972), consists of a number of mutually interdependent subsystems which interact dynamically. In order to achieve its explicit goals, the organization relies upon a division of labor and a hierarchy of authority and responsibility. The formal organization exists on the basis of a rational coordination of specific activities. As an open system, the organization responds to environmental stimuli, such as those provided by competitive concerns. Conflict may arise within an organizational context at several levels; conflict becomes a necessary predecessor to the achievement of progress within the organizational setting.

Theoretical Rationale

According to Coser (1956), conflict arising from an outside source causes a group to become more cohesive. Coser suggests that external conflict pulls members of an organization together in an effort to maximize resources against the outside agent. Through the creation of external conflict, organizational boundaries become strongly defined and group members become increasingly conscious of the bonds which tie them.

Shaw (1971) defines a group as two or more individuals who interact in such a way that each member influences the other(s). Inherent in this definition is an interdependent relationship that exists amoung group members; the behavior of one individual in a group, by definition, affects all of the other members. Cattell (1948) suggests that each member brings to the group his own perspectives and expectations; it is the individuals who give

Theoretical Rationale (continued)

the group its nature. According to Thibaut and Kelley (1959), group processes must be examined in light of the adjustments that the members make in order to resolve interdependent problems that arise. The researchers further contend that the existence of a particular group is dependent solely upon the participation of and the satisfaction derived by its members.

Cohesiveness, according to Deutsch and Krauss (1965), refers to the forces which bind together all group members and which cause them to remain together as a unit. Wenburg and Wilmot (1973) suggest that the cohesiveness of a group is directly related to the perceived attractiveness of the group to its individual members. Applbaum, Bodaken, Sereno, and Anatol (1974) contend that this attraction operates on both an interpersonal and group level, that an individual may be drawn to a group because of its individual members and/or because of what the group stands for as a whole. The researchers further suggest that as a group interacts and the members begin to trust one another, they solidify more as a unit and their structure becomes increasingly cohesive in nature.

Deutsch (1973) points out that while conflict can occur without the existence of a competitive environment, competition cannot take place without the occurence of conflict. Beck (1971) confirms this view in describing competition as a form of conflict among individuals or groups.

Perceived supervisor credibility has been the focus of several research studies. Falcione (1972) found a high correlation between perceived supervisor credibility and satisfaction with immediate supervision; the researcher demonstrated this relationship for all three of the credibility dimensions

Theoretical Rationale (continued)

he employed in the study (safety, qualification, and dynamism). Using the credibility dimensions established by Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz,[1] Falcione (1974a) demonstrated that certain specific behavioral components are related to subordinate perceptions of supervisor credibility. In another experiment, Falcione (1974b) found four dimensions associated with perceived immediate superior credibility: safety, competence, extroversion, and emotional stability.

No research has been reported in the literature dealing with the homophily construct and the perception of supervisors by subordinates. McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975) demonstrated that homophily is a multidimensional construct, its components being attitude, value, background, and appearance.

It has been shown that cohesiveness is related to exposure to external conflict. Since attraction has been shown to be related to cohesiveness, it seems reasonable to assume that other communication variables should be related to the construct through the introduction of external conflict.

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of external conflict upon perceived immediate superior credibility and homophily. This study was designed to examine source perception within a unidirectional framework; the focus of this research was the perception of immediate superiors by their subordinates.

To date, there has been no research relating conflict to source credibility or homophily. This research was designed to investigate these two

---

[1] Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969-1970).

Theoretical Rationale (continued)

variables in terms of external conflict within the organizational framework.

Statement of the Hypotheses

On the basis of the preceding literature review, the following hypotheses were postulated for this investigation:

H_1: Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior as more credible than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(a) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on a safety dimension of credibility than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(b) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on a competence dimension of credibility than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(c) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on an extroversion dimension of credibility than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(d) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on an emotional stability dimension of

Statement of the Hypotheses (continued)

credibility than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

H_2: Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior as more homophilous than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(a) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on an attitude dimension of homophily than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(b) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on a value dimension of homophily than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(c) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on an appearance dimension of homophily than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

(d) Subordinates who are exposed to external conflict, in conjunction with their immediate superior, will perceive their immediate superior more highly on a background dimension of homophily than those who are not exposed to external conflict.

Subjects

The subjects employed in this study were derived from a military organization.

Subjects (continued)

All subjects were males, between the ages of eighteen and thirty (the majority, 63%, were between eighteen and twenty), each having achieved at least a ninth-grade education (the majority, 60%, having completed high school). Twenty-five groups were utilized for purposes of this investigation, each group consisting of one superior and his three subordinates. This study employed intact groups, each featuring those who normally worked together in prescribed roles. Using a simple random selection technique, each unit of four individuals was designated as an experimental or control group. Two thirds of the the units, serving as experimental groups, were exposed to the "external conflict" treatment, while the remaining one-third, serving as control groups, were exposed to the "no external conflict" treatment. The superior-subordinate relationship was consistent among all groups in terms of working titles and the hierarchical structure of the organization. The length of time with which the subjects had been associated with the working unit under examination varied to some degree, with 19% under three months, 29% between three and six months, 12% between six and nine months, 15% between nine and twelve months, and 21% over one year (4%, no response). The majority of the subjects (47%) had been members of the military organization for between one and two years.

Materials

A posttest measure consisted of the immediate superior credibility scales developed by Falcione (1974b) and the homophily scales developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975). The credibility instrument contained thirty semantic differential-type scales. The homophily instrument contained sixteen semantic differential-type items.

Materials (continued)

The Broken Squares (nonverbal problem-solving) Exercise[2] was employed in this investigation as a problem-solving task in which all subjects participated.

Procedure

The posttest measure was administered immediately following the Broken Squares Exercise. Both instruments were administered to those holding a subordinate position within the working unit; no superiors completed either questionnaire.

Subjects were divided randomly into twenty-five groups for the Broken Squares Exercise; each group consisted of a superior and his three subordinates. Fifteen of the groups represented the "external conflict" groups and the other ten groups served as the "no external conflict" groups. The "external conflict" groups were told that they were competing with other individuals to complete the exercise and that time off from work would be provided to the group who finished the exercise first (this information was communicated to them by a higher ranking individual); the "no external conflict" groups were not given this information, thus eliminating any experimentally-induced competition factor or incentive factor. The room arrangements and seating arrangements were the same for both the "external conflict" and "no external conflict" groups. For all twenty-five groups, individual participants were equally positioned with respect to one antoher. The exercise and posttest measure were administered to all "external conflict" groups

---

[2] Pfeiffer and Jones, 1974, pages 25-30.

Procedure (continued)

in one room, but to all "no external conflict" groups in separate rooms. Just prior to the administration of the posttest measure, a brief questionnaire was given to all subordinates to determine whether or not they perceived competition and/or conflict, while participating in the exercise.

Instructions were given to all groups participating in the exercise by the individual representatives of the military organization (males, with approximately the same rank within the organization), so as to minimize the realization of the involvement of an outside researcher. Upon completion of the exercise and all questionnaires, all groups were debriefed by the researcher.

Data Analysis

Interval data for each group of three subordinates was collected on the basis of the semantic differential instruments (perceived immediate superior credibility and homophily) administered to them. A one-tailed t-test was employed to determine if significant relationships existed between the "external conflict" and "no external conflict" groups in the perception of those in the supervisory positions. Data was analyzed in terms of both constructs and each of their respective dimensions as they emerged in the factor analyses performed. In addition, a two-tailed t-test was employed in conducting a manipulation check on the independent variable, using the brief competition/conflict questionnaire as a basis for analysis.

For both the one-tailed and two-tailed t-tests, a .05 level was adopted as an acceptable criterion for significance. The criteria used in interpreting

Data Analysis (continued)

the results of the factor analyses were: (1) for termination of factor extraction, an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established; (2) for an item to considered as being loaded on a factor, a primary loading of .60 or higher was required, with no secondary loading higher than .40; and (3) for a factor to be considered meaningful, it was to consist of at least two items with satisfactory loadings.

Seven dimensions emerged as a result of the factor analysis on the source credibility items, as reported in Table 2. The first dimension (containing four items), the third dimension (containing three items), and the fifth dimension (containing two items) all seemed to resemble a safety factor (the first dimension, in addition, contained what might be considered one competence item). The second dimension, consisting of two items, appeared to be a composure dimension. The fourth dimension (containing two items) and the sixth dimension (containing two items) both seemed to resemble a competence/extroversion factor. The seventh factor, consisting of two items, appeared to be an extroversion factor.

Three dimensions emerged as a result of the factor analysis on the homophily construct items, as reported in Table 4. The first dimension, containing four items, seemed to be a value/behavior factor. The second dimension, consisting of three items, appeared to be a value factor. The third dimension, containing three items, seemed to be a background/attitude factor.

As a whole, 66.7% of the subjects reported perceiving competition during the course of the exercise, while 29.3% reported they did not (4%, no response). Within the experimental groups (the "external conflict" groups), 82.2% of the respondents noted the perception of competition, while 17.8%

Data Analysis (continued)

did not. Within the control groups (the "no external conflict" groups), 43.3% of the subjects reported perceiving competition during the course of the exercise, while 46.7% reported they did not (10%, no response). As shown in Table 5, the two-tailed t-test between the experimental and control groups relative to the perception of competition revealed a significant difference at the .05 level, predicated upon homogeneity of variance.

In contrast, 24% of the subjects, as a whole, reported perceiving conflict during the course of the exercise, while 72% reported they did not (4%, no response). Within the experimental groups, 35.6% indicated they perceived conflict, while 64.4% did not. Within the control groups, 6.7% reported perceiving conflict during the course of the exercise, while 83.3% reported they did not (10%, no response). As shown in Table 5, the two-tailed t-test between the experimental and control groups relative to the perception of conflict revealed a significant difference at the .05 level, predicated upon heterogeneity of variance.

Independent one-tailed t-tests on all of the thirty source credibility items employed in the study revealed significant differences between the experimental and control groups in only two, as reported in Table 6. The first scale item, "friendly-unfriendly," was found significant at the .05 level, predicated upon heterogeneity of variance. The second scale item, "just-unjust," was found significant at the .05 level, predicated upon homogeneity of variance.

Independent one-tailed t-tests on all of the sixteen homophily items utilized in the study revealed significant difference between the experimental and control groups in only four, as shown in Table 7. The first scale item,

Data Analysis (continued)

"background similar to mine-background different from mine," was found significant at the .05 level, predicated upon homogeneity of variance. The second scale item, "sexual attitudes like mine-sexual attitudes unlike mine," was shown to be significant at the .05 level, predicated upon heterogeneity of variance. The third scale item, "shares my values-doesn't share my values," was found significant at the .05 level, predicated upon heterogeneity of variance. The fourth scale item, "appearance like mine-appearance unlike mine," was shown to be significant at the .05 level, predicated upon homogeneity of variance.

The performance of one-tailed t-tests on the seven credibility factors extracted in this study revealed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups, as shown in Table 8. The application of one-tailed t-tests on the three homophily factors which emerged in this study revealed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups, as reported in Table 9.

Discussion

This study was unable to provide clear support for either of the hypotheses postulated, or their respective subunit categories. No significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups in the perception of superiors by subordinates in terms of the dimensions of credibility and homophily which emerged in this study.

The fact that only two of the credibility scale items and four of the homophily scale items were found to be significant, all rather unrelated to one another within each construct, suggests the serious consideration of

Discussion (continued)

problems which may have arisen with the study. While the theoretical rationale for this research appears to have been adequately developed, several methodological aspects of the study may have precluded the generation of more significant results.

At least some discrepancy was observed in each of the demographic categories between the experimental and control groups. While 9.2% more subjects in the experimental groups fell into the eighteen to twenty age category than those in the control groups, 11.7% more subjects in the control groups fell into the twenty-one to twenty-five age category than those in the experimental groups. Although 9.2% more of the subjects in the control groups had only completed the ninth grade than those in the experimental groups, 10% more of the subjects in the experimental groups had only completed the eleventh grade than those in the control groups.

In terms of the length of time the subjects had been associated with their working unit, the following differentials were observed: (1) control groups 22.5% more than experimental groups in the three to six months category; (2) control groups 13.3% more than experimental groups in the six to nine months category; (3) experimental groups 12.5% more than control groups in the nine to twelve months category; and (4) experimental groups 22.5% more than control groups in the over one year category.

In terms of the length of time the subjects had been members of the military organization, the following differentials were found: (1) experimental groups 11.7% more than the control groups in the three to six months category; (2) control groups 15.8% more than experimental groups in the six months to one year category; (3) experimental groups 15 8% more than control

Discussion (continued)

groups in the one to two years category; and (4) control groups 11.7% more than experimental groups in the three to four years category.

While a minimum of a three-months' working relationship was initially requested by the researcher in seeking out subjects for the study, 19% of the men derived from the military organization did not meet this requirement for reasons out of the control of the researcher.

Althougn the manipulation of the independent variable appears to have been successful, a rather substantially higher percentage of subjects did not perceive conflict (64.4%) in the experimental groups than did (35.6%). While a statistically significant fewer number of subjects in the control groups perceived conflict (6.7%) than in the experimental groups (35.6%) and a statistically significant greater number of subjects perceived competition in the experimental groups (82.2%) than in the control groups (43.3%), suggesting successful manipulation of the independent variable, it does point to, perhaps, an operational definition problem in the perception of conflict. The rationale for this study, specifically that provided by Deutsch (1973) and Beck (1971), infers that competition cannot occur without the existence of conflict. In asking subjects, in this or any other study, whether or not they perceived competition and/or conflict, a rather literal definition may be utilized in reference to the second term, especially in the case of military personnel. The Broken Squares Exercise, as employed in this research, could provide for the perception of a competitive environment (were certain factors introduced, such as a reward for completing the exercise before others in the same room), but not necessarily for the perception of a conflictive environment, at least, perhaps, as military personnel operationalize it.

Discussion (continued)

The two factor analyses for this study were performed on the basis of a subject population of seventy-five, the subordinates from both the experimental and control groups. The size of the sample from which these analyses were drawn may not have been sufficiently high to produce the appropriate results. Research by Tucker (1971), as well as other individuals, points to the necessity of conducting a factor analysis on the basis of the particular subjects and target sources in such a study, since perceptual categories utilized by the subjects may be different (as well as those in regard to the specific target sources) from those employed by the subjects in the original research designed to establish the existence of factors for the particular constructs. The fact that no more than seventy-five subordinates were utilized in this research was due to a limitation on military resources.

Future research is advocated on the basis of the theoretical rationale advanced in this study, with possible modifications in the methodology: (1) that a longer working association between supervisor and subordinate be incorporated (as well as in being relatively consistent throughout); (2) that a clearer distinction between supervisor and subordinate be drawn, most specifically in terms of relative rank within the hierarchy of the organization; (3) that a higher education level be a criteria for the subject population, so as to ensure the clear comprehension of the specific bipolar credibility and homophily scale items; and (4) that a lengthier, perhaps more job-applied, exercise be implemented as the task at which supervisors and subordinates work together in opposition to an external agent (for example, within the military context, war games).

The rationale developed to support this research raises some interesting

Discussion (continued)

issues which require further study at the organizational level: (1) should organizations actively seek to create activities to enhance subordinate perception of supervisors through the introduction of external conflict agents (for example, through the introduction of occasional contests between independent working units of the organization, the tasks for which both supervisors and subordinates become involved); (2) if the perception of a supervisor is enhanced through the introduction of an external conflict situation, does it ever generalize to other individuals at the level of the supervisor within the organization or to other individuals above, but responsible for, that particular supervisor; (3) if the perception of a supervisor is enhanced through the introduction of an external conflict situation, does it have lasting effects upon the supervisor-subordinate relationship or is it merely temporary; and (4) does the change in this perception, if it does occur, affect future task productivity or communicative patterns between supervisor and subordinate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Applbaum, Ronald L., Bodaken, Edward M., Sereno, Kenneth K., Anatol, Karl W. E. The Process of Group Communication. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1974.

Beck, Don E. Communication through confrontation: A case study in intergroup conflict reduction. Paper presented at ICA convention, Phoenix, Arizona, April 1971.

Berlo, David K., Lemert, James B., Mertz, Robert J. Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1969-1970, 33, 563-576.

Cattell, Raymond B. Concepts and methods in the measurement of group syntality. Psychological Review, 1948, 55, 48-63.

Coser, Lewis. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York, New York: The Free Press, 1956.

Deutsch, Morton. The Resolution of Conflict. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1973.

Deutsch, Morton, Krauss, Robert M. Theories in Social Psychology. New York, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Falcione, Raymond L. A correlational analysis of communication variables and satisfaction with immediate supervision in a large industrial organization. Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1972.

_____. Behavioral components of perceived supervisor credibility. Paper presented at ICA convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1974 (a).

_____. The factor structure of source credibility scales for immediate superiors in the organizational context. Central States Speech Journal, 1974, 25, 63-66 (b).

McCroskey, James C., Richmond, Virginia P., Daly, John A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

Pfeiffer, J. William, Jones, John E. Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training. San Diego, California: University Research Associates, Volume 1, 1974.

Schein, Edgar. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Shaw, Marvin E. Group Dynamics: The Psychology of Small Group Behavior. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Thibaut, John W., Kelley, Harold H. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Tucker, Raymond K. On the McCroskey scales for the measurement of ethos. Central States Speech Journal, 1971, 22, 127-129.

Wenburg, John R., Wilmot, William W. The Personal Communication Process. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Table 1

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT**

(n = 75)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Identification of Variable
1	0.15842	-0.03526	0.30014	0.16385	0.79219*	0.15500	-0.05000	0.02388	-0.06912	honest-dishonest
2	0.01428	-0.04743	0.80093*	0.07336	0.12181	0.18880	0.06408	-0.04048	0.12996	friendly-unfriendly
3	0.18651	0.16612	0.48091	-0.17742	0.21434	0.26783	0.28925	-0.52560	-0.05376	pleasant-unpleasant
4	0.80315*	0.08903	0.02599	0.28449	0.18018	-0.10598	0.17184	0.03419	0.02374	nice-awful
5	0.62880	-0.13632	0.45861	-0.04788	0.35243	0.01883	0.17020	-0.02519	0.18095	good-natured-irritable
6	0.72501*	0.02239	0.19426	0.02250	-0.22154	0.14458	-0.04685	0.15303	0.22389	cooperative-negativistic
7	0.79855*	0.03924	-0.07724	0.04483	0.25985	0.10666	-0.14837	0.17415	-0.06643	safe-dangerous
8	0.45923	0.32907	0.33126	0.01902	0.20741	0.15099	-0.14010	0.36872	0.10792	just-unjust
9	0.08089	-0.08107	0.13325	0.06357	0.85757*	0.05763	-0.02075	0.11034	0.06406	unselfish-selfish
10	0.37563	-0.05720	0.66717*	0.21920	0.28648	-0.19844	-0.04038	0.12388	-0.02661	fair-unfair
11	0.25611	0.24298	0.39110	0.08697	0.01525	0.53030	0.16967	0.17990	-0.00494	ethical-unethical

--- continued ---

* Variable met criteria for factor loading

** Those factors (seven) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 66.3% of the variance

Table 1

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT** (CONTINUED)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Identification of Variable
12	-0.11553	0.13884	0.06375	0.05381	-0.02129	-0.44813	-0.23915	-0.16003	0.66979	mild-headstrong
13	0.17224	-0.05565	0.08535	0.03824	0.00947	0.31195	0.08941	0.02384	0.77524*	virtuous-sinful
14	0.02623	0.28809	0.66598*	-0.12644	0.03173	0.22232	-0.11419	0.09460	-0.00840	not jealous-jealous
15	0.26592	-0.04003	0.02010	0.40612	0.22637	0.70030	-0.16709	0.01591	-0.10418	trained-untrained
16	0.14798	0.18078	0.17939	0.38469	0.02626	0.77233*	-0.02966	0.06631	-0.00569	experience-inexperienced
17	0.46771	0.19723	-0.13920	-0.11665	0.52590	0.43712	0.04061	0.20235	-0.14220	informed-uninformed
18	0.15205	0.12901	0.01950	0.82288*	-0.02862	0.19648	0.13515	0.03249	0.11223	expert-inexpert
19	0.64854*	0.25042	0.20365	0.25181	0.01013	0.32682	-0.08067	0.00097	-0.25888	skilled-unskilled
20	0.32892	0.42425	0.16473	0.23374	0.22566	0.36349	-0.02929	0.37440	-0.04429	fast-slow
21	-0.05441	-0.07081	0.09369	-0.08742	0.07401	0.72504*	0.14113	0.14127	0.15500	bold-timid
22	0.17264	-0.13306	-0.01391	0.69391*	0.33151	0.22500	0.02484	0.30975	-0.05936	aggressive-meek
23	-0.02767	0.54070	-0.03591	-0.06490	-0.05716	0.33153	0.42217	0.22182	-0.01818	emphatic-hesitant
24	-0.05149	0.06885	-0.01490	0.11862	-0.06427	0.06549	0.85495*	0.06669	-0.02030	adventurous-cautious
25	0.23167	0.00289	0.03077	0.15056	0.15250	0.21056	0.25761	0.65898*	0.06022	forceful-forceless

--- continued---

*Variable met criteria for factor loading
**Those factors (seven) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 66.3% of the variance

Table 1

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT** (CONTINUED)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Identification of Variable
26	0.32737	-0.17405	0.12824	0.04342	0.12310	0.33687	0.01037	0.62807*	-0.32193	active-passive
27	0.06150	0.28717	0.32655	0.17208	0.17697	0.25418	0.39491	0.42174	-0.17038	poised-nervous
28	0.09828	0.82409*	0.06702	0.07803	-0.10327	0.02869	-0.13696	-0.05249	-0.05716	calm-anxious
29	0.05836	0.71760*	0.06367	-0.00151	-0.00369	-0.05001	0.35290	-0.13146	0.13142	composed-excitable
30	0.00284	0.17959	0.18834	0.40505	0.14775	0.64552	0.16861	0.13807	0.00915	poised-tense
	28.4%	9.4%	8.2%	6.6%	5.2%	4.7%	4.3%	3.7%	3.5%	variance accounte for by factor

* Variable met criteria for factor loading
** Those factors (seven) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 66.3% of the variance

Table 2

FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT

(n = 75)

FACTOR 1

skilled - unskilled
cooperative - negativistic
safe - dangerous
nice - awful

FACTOR 2

calm - anxious
composed - excitable

FACTOR 3

not jealous - jealous
fair - unfair
friendly - unfriendly

FACTOR 4

expert - inexpert
aggressive - meek

FACTOR 5

honest - dishonest
unselfish - selfish

FACTOR 6

bold - timid
experienced - inexperienced

FACTOR 7

active - passive
forceful - forceless

Table 3

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR HOMOPHILY CONSTRUCT**

(n = 75)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Identification of Variable
1	0.05759	0.20850	0.69490*	0.17388	-0.05368	Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me
2	0.66228*	0.11084	0.10601	-0.00863	0.33088	Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me
3	0.73540*	0.39376	0.22327	-0.05883	-0.12710	Similar to me-Different from me
4	0.24769	0.77960*	0.19245	0.20578	0.12208	Like me-Unlike me
5	0.57541	0.29941	0.13876	-0.04504	0.39212	From social class similar to me-From social class different from mine
6	0.06381	0.36145	0.67036*	0.18875	-0.13469	Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine
7	0.14892	0.07664	0.68304*	-0.18030	0.34388	Status like mine-Status different from mine
8	0.06699	0.35883	0.41888	0.60681	0.11977	Background similar to mine-Background different from mine
9	0.08810	0.67545*	0.24774	-0.02124	0.25450	Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine
10	0.09151	0.84856*	0.12338	0.27533	0.02570	Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine
11	0.60421*	0.20273	0.16807	0.34181	-0.13663	Shares my values-Doesn't share my values
12	0.77009*	-0.09759	-0.06918	0.11642	0.12426	Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do
13	0.44466	-0.06055	0.51446	0.34490	0.44713	Looks similar to me-Looks different from me
14	0.01077	0.10338	-0.06	0.82277*	-0.02718	Same size as I am-Different size than I am
15	0.12324	0.19725	-0.00784	0.10808	0.81239*	Appearance like mine-Appearance unlike mine
16	0.23072	0.14828	0.31303	0.55810	0.28085	Resembles me-Doesn't resemble me
	34.0%	11.2%	7.7%	7.1%	6.3%	Variance accounted for by factor

* Variable met criteria for factor loading

** Those factors (3) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 52.9% of the variance

Table 4

FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR HOMOPHILY CONSTRUCT

(n = 75)

FACTOR 1

Shares my values-Doesn't share my values
Similar to me-Different from me
Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do
Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me

FACTOR 2

Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine
Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine
Like me-Unlike me

FACTOR 3

Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine
Status like mine-Status different from mine
Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me

Table 5

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- MANIPULATION CHECK OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	t Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
Perception of Competition	-3.21*	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Perception of Conflict	-3.18*	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance

* Significant at .05 level

Table 6

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- CREDIBILITY SCALE ITEMS

Variable	t-Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
honest-dishonest	-0.57	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
friendly-unfriendly	2.10*	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
pleasant-unpleasant	0.63	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
nice-awful	-0.99	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
good-natured-irritable	0.45	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
cooperative-negativistic	0.75	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
safe-dangerous	-1.54	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
just-unjust	1.87*	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
unselfish-selfish	0.92	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
fair-unfair	-0.52	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
ethical-unethical	1.31	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
mild-headstrong	1.10	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
virtuous-sinful	1.49	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
not jealous-jealous	1.22	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
trained-untrained	1.02	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
experienced-inexperienced	0.75	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
informed-uninformed	-0.08	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
expert-inexpert	-0.90	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
skilled-unskilled	-0.50	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 6

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- CREDIBILITY SCALE ITEMS (CONTINUED)

Variable	t-Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
fast-slow	-0.50	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
bold-timid	1.01	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
aggressive-meek	0.03	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
emphatic-hesitant	-0.03	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
adventurous-cautious	0.63	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
forceful-forceless	1.29	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
active-passive	-0.77	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
poised-nervous	0.87	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
calm-anxious	1.12	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
composed-excitable	-0.33	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
poised-tense	0.60	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance

Table 7

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- HOMOPHILY SCALE ITEMS

Variable	t-Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me	1.19	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me	1.25	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Similar to me-Different from me	0.43	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Like me-unlike me	1.64	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
From social class similar to mine-From social class different from mine	-0.09	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine	0.55	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Status like mine-Status different from mine	0.20	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Background similar to mine-Background different from mine	2.67*	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine	0.85	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine	3.18*	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
Shares my values-Doesn't share my values	1.91*	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do	-0.39	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Looks similar to me-Looks different from me	0.46	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Same size as I am-Different size than I am	1.00	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Appearance like mine-Appearance unlike mine	2.14*	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
Resembles me-Doesn't resemble me	1.51	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance

* Significant at .05 level

Table 8

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- CREDIBILITY FACTORS

Factor	t-Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
1	-0.10	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
2	0.41	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
3	0.55	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
4	-0.47	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
5	0.20	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
6	1.43	Predicated upon heterogeneity of variance
7	0.36	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance

Table 9

T-TESTS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS -- HOMOPHILY FACTORS

Factor	t-Value	Homogeneous/ Heterogeneous
1	1.00	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
2	1.54	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance
3	1.26	Predicated upon homogeneity of variance